MIGRATION POLICY INSTITUTE

Policy Brief

INDEPENDENT TASK FORCE ON IMMIGRATION AND AMERICA'S FUTURE

January 2006 ■ No. 15

SUMMARY

Much of US legal admissions policy was formulated in the 1960s, with some changes in the 1990s to reflect new realities. Foreign workers are admitted through two, inter-connected admissions categories: permanent immigration and temporary work programs. The current system has some strengths in serving as a conduit for employment-based admissions, but its many weaknesses reduce its ability to meet labor market needs or to protect adequately either domestic or foreign workers. Its principal strength is bringing to the country talented immigrants who have high levels of employment.

Among the problems is the inflexibility of the ceilings applied to various admission categories; processing and administrative complexity and delays; inadequate mechanisms to measure labor-market demand; inadequate protection for temporary workers; failure to recognize the transitional, rather than temporary, nature of many non-immigrant visa categories; and the very complexity of the current employment-based system. This Policy Brief outlines the major permanent and temporary admissions categories, discusses the weaknesses mentioned above, and concludes with principles for improving the employment-based immigration system.

US Employment-Based Admissions: Permanent and Temporary

Susan Martin
Director, Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University

Background

US employment-based policies are ostensibly demand-driven. In most categories, employers petition for the admission of workers whom they wish to hire. The onus is on them to demonstrate that they have tested the labor market for a domestic hire and/or are taking steps to protect the domestic labor market, particularly by paying foreign workers prevailing wages. A totally different system chooses foreign workers on a supply-side basis. Point systems are a well-known way to attract human capital. Most do not test the labor market, in contrast to demand-driven systems, as they tend to be based on the presumption that persons with education or specific skills, knowledge of the local language, youth and other desirable characteristics will benefit the overall economy and society.

Permanent Immigration

During the 1990s, the United States admitted about 825,000 legal immigrants each year, up from about 600,000 a year in the 1980s (not counting those legalized under the 1986 amnesty), 450,000 a year in the 1970s, and 330,000 a year in the 1960s. As immigration was increasing, the

major countries of origin changed, from Europe to Latin America and Asia.

The four principal bases or doors for admission are family reunification (either sponsored by green card holders or naturalized citizens), employment, diversity, and humanitarian interests. By far the largest admissions door is for relatives of US residents. The second-largest category of immigrants is immigrants and their family members admitted for economic or employment reasons. Refugees, asylees and other humanitarian admissions are the third-largest category. Finally, about 50,000 immigrants come under the diversity visa category — immigrants from countries that have not recently sent large numbers of immigrants to the United States.

US employment-based policies are ostensibly demand-driven.

During the latter 1990s, about 450,000 immigrants joined the US labor force each year, accounting for about 25 percent of the US yearly average increase of 1.7 million. Most of these migrants (90 percent) are chosen because of family, humanitarian, or other criteria that do not consider labor market factors. During the past twenty years, there have been persistent calls for a shifting of admission numbers from family categories, under which many immigrants with less than a high school education enter, to skills-based ones that attract more highly educated immigrants.

The employment-based immigration category is divided into five preferences, or groupings, each with its own admission ceiling. The highest priority goes to persons of extraordinary ability, outstanding professors and researchers, and executives and managers of multinational corporations. The second group includes professionals with advanced degrees and workers of exceptional ability. The third group is composed of other professionals, skilled workers, and a limited number of other workers; with the fourth permitting entry of religious workers; and the fifth including entrepreneurs admitted for activities creating employment. Unused numbers in higher priority groups can be passed down to lower priorities.

Not surprisingly, the employment-based immigrants are much more highly skilled than any other class of immigrants. Nearly 20 percent are in managerial or executive occupations, and another two-thirds are professionals and technical sales workers (over 80 percent together). In contrast, only about one-fifth of family-sponsored immigrants are found in these two highly skilled occupational categories. Diversity immigrants, for whom a high school degree is required, are at an intermediate level, with about 45 percent finding work in these two occupational categories. Refugees, for whom there are no economic screens, are found most concentrated in operators, fabricators, and laborer occupations (41 percent).

Most employment-based immigrants are sponsored by employers. There are some clear advantages to such a system. Not surprisingly, rates of employment among these immigrants are very high since they already have jobs and, generally, a supportive employer. Some argue that employers are the best judges of the economic contributions an individual can make. A checklist, as used in a point system, may identify would-be migrants with educational or language skills, but arguably these individuals may not have capabilities that are more difficult to measure but that employers find valuable, such as an ability to work in teams.

The mechanisms to determine the legitimacy of employer demand can be quite cumbersome. Most employment-based admissions are subject to labor certification provisions. The employer must demonstrate that (a) there are not sufficient US workers who are able, willing, qualified, and available at the time of the application for a visa and admission into the United States and at the place where the alien is to perform the work; and (b) the employment of the alien will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of similarly employed United States workers. Under new streamlined rules, the employer must attest to having recruited US workers using prescribed mechanisms and demonstrate why applicants were not suitable to the job.

In some cases, the Department of Labor (DOL) has established a Schedule (A) of occupations for which there are "not sufficient US workers who are able, willing, qualified and available." These do not require a test of the labor market for green card admission. This list includes a rather limited number of occupations. The labor certification process normally requires an attorney's help, and the wait for approval can be several years, first at DOL and then US Citizenship and Immigration Services (UCIS) at the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), which assumed responsibility from the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Alternatives to labor certification have been proposed by a number of academics and experts. Some mechanisms test demand by pricing immigration in a way that tests employers' resolve, others use objective measures of shortages or demand to vary visa allotments. For example, the Congressional-appointed "Jordan Commission" for Immigration Reform proposed that employers could hire the immigrants quickly and easily if they paid a substantial $10,000 fee to a fund that would provide scholarships for US workers willing to be trained to fill the jobs going to foreigners. The idea was to make it equally or more expensive to hire a foreign worker as it would be to hire a domestic one, with the fee going into a pool that would help fill skills shortages. For lower skilled positions, where training would not necessarily be needed to fill shortages, the fee could support testing of mechanization and other alternatives to admission of foreign workers. Auctions have been proposed as another way to test employer demand.

The mechanisms to determine the legitimacy of employer demand can be quite cumbersome.

Because the US system is employer/employee-driven and a job offer is essential, most of those admitted to permanent residence in the employment-based categories are already in the United States. Due to delays in labor certification, employers tend to use temporary visa categories to bridge the gap between the decision to hire the worker and the government's grant of permanent resident status. As a result, the recruitment process required by labor certification rules is often a farce, the employer having already hired the foreign worker.

Temporary Workers

Temporary work categories are increasingly important as the vehicle for admission of foreign workers in all skill categories. Each year, hundreds of thousands of visas are issued to temporary workers and their family members. In addition, an unknown number of foreign students are employed either in addition to their studies or immediately thereafter in practical training. The growth in the number of foreign workers admitted for temporary stays reflects global economic trends. In fast-chang-

ing industries, such as information technology, having access to a global labor market of skilled professionals is highly attractive. Also, as companies contract out work, or hire contingent labor to work on specific projects, the appeal of temporary visas, rather than permanent admissions, is clear. Some foreign firms, understanding that it may not be possible to undertake an entire project offshore, obtain temporary work visas to the United States so their employees can complete the job at the US client's facilities. The temporary programs also give employers and employees a chance to test each other before committing to permanent employment. Multinational corporations find the temporary categories useful in bringing their own foreign personnel to work or receive training in the United States.

Temporary work categories are increasingly important as the vehicle for admission of foreign workers in all skill categories.

Over time, a large number of different temporary admission visa categories have amassed, each referred to by the letter of the alphabet under which it is described in the Immigration and Nationality Act. The visa categories now encompass almost the entire alphabet (A-V). The principal sections under which temporary workers enter are the H1-B for specialty workers, H-2A for agricultural workers, H2-B for other seasonal workers, E visa for traders and investors entering under bilateral treaties, L for intracompany transfers, and J for exchange scholars among others. Smaller numbers enter under the O visa (extraordinary ability in the sciences, arts, education, business, or athletics), P (artist or entertainer), Q (cultural exchange and training), and R (religious workers) visa categories. In addition, there are visa categories for officials of foreign governments, foreign journalists, and officials of the United Nations and other intergovernmental organizations. Professionals, managers and executives may also enter under the North American Free Trade Agreement. With the exception of the H2-A and H2-B visas, all of these temporary work categories require a significant level of skills or education.

The regulations governing admissions vary from visa to visa. The high-skilled H-1B visa generally requires that the worker has a Bachelor's degree and that the employer first "attest" that they will pay prevailing wages and conform to certain employment conditions. There is no pre-test of the labor market. Holders of these visas may stay for three years and reapply for an extension of stay for up to six years with either the same or a different employer. They may intend to apply for permanent residency and about half do so. If there are delays in receiving a green card, their temporary work visa may be extended beyond the six years. By contrast, H-2 visas, like the permanent employment visas, require employers to first test the labor market and receive a DOL certification that they did so. They cannot intend to stay beyond the term of their visa, which typically is for a stay of no more than one year.

Movement of foreign workers for temporary reasons at today's levels is a new phenomenon for the United States. Statistics on temporary admissions count every entry into the United States and, hence, are a multiple count of oftentimes the same individual. Nonetheless, only 770,000 temporary admissions (including tourists and business visitors) were counted in the first decade of the 20th century, a number that went on to increase to 7 million in the 1950s, and by the last decade of the century, there were some 230 million temporary admissions. The number of admissions of H and L visa holders increased from fewer than

200,000 in 1985 to more than 1.2 million in 2001. Because these are multiple counts, they reflect both a stupendous increase in the number of individuals involved and a significant increase in back and forth mobility.

Revolutions in transportation, tourism, and the global economy are driving a level of temporary international mobility not prefigured by past experience. To be sure, a substantial fraction of the supposedly "permanent" international flows of yesteryear was actually temporary migrants or "birds of passage." That dynamic exists today, as well. It is common for "permanent" immigrants to circulate regularly to their original homeland and many immigrants end up returning home for good. However, the temporary movement that exists today is fundamentally different because it is not a by-product of otherwise permanent visa holders. More precisely, policy mechanisms explicitly define it as "temporary" at the outset. The only major precedent for such policies in the United States is the Bracero Program under which Mexican seasonal workers entered the country from its inception during World War II until its end in the 1960s.

The class of so-defined temporary movement has reached levels that easily surpass the level of permanent immigration itself. In 2004, DHS counted the admission of 155,000 permanent legal residents in the employment categories, out of a total of about 950,000 immigrant admissions. In the same year, a total of 5 million individual temporary visas were issued by the State Department, of which about 1.3 million were for work or study.

Policy Issues

There are a number of policy issues surrounding both the permanent and temporary systems of employment-based admissions.

Ceilings on both permanent and temporary admission categories limit flexibility to address changes in labor market demand.

Inflexible Ceilings

Ceilings on both permanent and temporary admission categories limit flexibility to address changes in labor market demand. In the permanent admission categories, two types of ceilings are imposed: ceilings on overall and subcategory numbers and per-country ceilings. By legislation, there are 140,000 numbers available for employment-based permanent admissions plus any unused family-based visas from the previous year. Ceilings are set for each sub-category although unused visas can flow down to other categories. There are also per-country limits that ensure that no more than 7 percent of visas go to any one country. The American Competitiveness in the Twenty-First Century Act (AC21) recaptured a "pool" of 131,000 employment numbers unused in fiscal years 1999 and 2000, however, and allowed those recaptured numbers to be used in subsequent years for countries that had met the ceiling.

As Table 1 shows, during the past few years there have been a substantial number of unused family visas, largely because of processing delays, so the employment ceilings have been increased. The actual number admitted was above the ceiling in FY 2002 but below the ceiling in the other two years (see section below on processing delays). According to the Visa Bulletin of the US State Department, the addition of unused FY 2005 family numbers and the remaining AC21 numbers to the 140,000 annual minimum will result in an FY 2006 annual employment limit of 152,000. The State Department is expecting that per-country limits will be reinstated in FY

Table 1. Employment-Based Immigration: Ceilings and Actual Admissions

Category	FY 2002 Ceiling (Actual)	FY 2003 Ceiling (Actual)	FY 2004 Ceiling (Actual)
EB-1: Priority Workers	40,793[1] (34,452)	49,058[1] (14,544)	58,465[1] (31,291)
EB-2: Professionals with advanced degrees, and persons with exceptional ability	40,793[2] (44,468)	49,058[2] (15,459)	58,465[2] (32,534)
EB-3: Skilled workers, professional and other workers	40,793[2] (88,555)	49,058[2] (46,613)	58,464[2] (85,969)
EB-4: Certain special immigrants	10,127 (7,344)	9,940 (5,456)	14,514 (5,407)
EB-5: Employment creation (investors)	10,127 (149)	9,940 (65)	14,514 (129)
TOTAL	142,632 (174,968)	171,532 (82,137)	204,422 (155,330)

[1] plus unused EB-4 and 5 visas
[2] plus unused visas from higher categories

Source: US Department of Homeland Security Office of Immigration Statistics, *Yearbooks of Immigration Statistics: 2002-2004*.

2006, and heavy demand for visas will cause backlogs in a number of categories. The November Visa Bulletin anticipates no visas will be available for applicants for third preference visas who applied after March 2001. There will be backlogs for China and India in the first and second preferences, as well. In fact, Indians with advanced degrees (2nd preference) had to have applied before November 1999 (a full six years ago) to gain admission in November 2005.

Inflexible ceilings have also created difficulties in the temporary worker programs. The H1-B program is capped at 65,000 visas per year. Although the ceiling was raised in the late 1990s following the dot.com boom, the numbers reverted to the original level during the dot.com bust. They were not raised again as the economy recovered. On October 1, 2004 — the first day of the fiscal year — US Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) announced that it had received enough applications to meet the fiscal year ceiling and would not be accepting any more applications. Ceilings also apply to the H2-B program. USCIS announced in January 2005 that it had reached the ceiling of 66,000 visas. Legislation passed in 2005 provided certain exemptions from the ceilings that permitted new applications to be processed.

Congress is again considering short-term fixes to the problem but it is not getting to the fundamental problem — that ceilings set in stone in legislation are too inflexible to respond in a

timely manner to changes in the economy and labor market demand. If the concern is with abuse of the visa categories, market tests can be used to weed out inappropriate use of the visas. The US Commission on Immigration Reform recommended that fees be set at a level that makes it more expensive for an employer to bring in a foreign worker than recruit and train a domestic person for the position. As discussed, labor certification provisions have been used to test the market for some categories, but these procedures pose problems of their own.

Administrative and Processing Delays

Adding to the statutory limits are administrative and processing delays that make the permanent admissions program, in particular, ineffective in meeting many labor market demands. Steps have been taken by the Department of Labor (DOL) to reduce the time needed to approve a labor certification application, and Citizenship and Immigration Services has taken steps to reduce the processing of applications, but the period still is in excess of most company's hiring cycles. In effect, there is a three-stage process at work for most employment-based immigration. The Department of Labor must first demonstrate there is no US worker available for the job (labor certification). Then, USCIS determines that the foreign national applicant qualifies for admission, via adjudication of a petition referred to as an I-140. With that approval, the applicant can apply for adjustment of status (I-485 application) if already in the United States or a visa if abroad. As DOL and USCIS reduce the backlog of cases in administrative limbo, more cases are subject to the statutory ceilings discussed above and waiting times have accordingly lengthened.

Few Incentives for Compliance

At present, there are few incentives for employers to use legal foreign worker programs, particularly to hire unskilled workers, and no effective sanctions against employers who hire unauthorized foreign workers. Most temporary and permanent foreign worker programs involve costs to the employer in time and money. Given the highly inefficient systems in place, many employers prefer to use existing networks of employees to refer and vet job seekers. Even if they are not looking for unauthorized workers, the employers may well hire them through these networks, which are highly efficient in filling shortages. The current system of employer sanctions requires the employer to check documents but not to verify the authorization of any given employee to work in the United States. As long as the employer has fulfilled the paperwork requirements and has not knowingly hired an unauthorized worker, the employer need not fear penalties. Without an efficient and effective system for verifying work authorization and sanctioning non-compliance, employers are left with few incentives to use government-regulated programs. Moreover, if these programs are as inefficient as demonstrated by current practice, the incentives are even fewer.

There are few incentives for employers to use legal foreign worker programs, particularly to hire unskilled workers, and no effective sanctions against employers who hire unauthorized foreign workers.

At the same time, workers have few incentives to enter legally if they are able to obtain employment via their networks, and face little prospect of apprehension or removal once they make it into the interior of the country. The growth in unauthorized migration is testament to the ease with which people who enter

without inspection or overstay their visas have been able to circumvent US immigration policy.

Inadequate and Inappropriate Mechanisms to Protect the Rights of Workers

In immigration policy, there often appears to be a trade-off between the numbers who will be admitted and the rights of those who are allowed to enter. At one extreme is the large and rapidly growing number of foreign nationals without authorization to work in the United States who are nevertheless gainfully employed. They have few rights in the workplace, are vulnerable to exploitation, and have very restricted eligibility for social welfare programs. In the middle are temporary workers who have more rights in the workplace but are often tied to a particular employer and may remain in a limbo status for many years while awaiting a green card. Lawful permanent residents have the same workplace rights as US citizens but their access to certain safety net programs (including those designed for low-income workers) is restricted. Naturalized citizens have full rights and obligations as US citizens.

As with other immigration matters, there are trade-offs in using temporary admission categories to meet labor market needs. While they may help increase business productivity and even generate job growth, they also render even highly skilled foreign workers more vulnerable to exploitation and may, thereby, depress wages and undermine working conditions for US workers. Generally, the foreign worker is tied to a specific employer who has requested the visa. Loss of employment may also mean the threat of deportation. Moreover, because the temporary visa is so often a testing period, the foreign worker may put up with any conditions imposed by the employer, fearing loss otherwise of the chance at permanent resident status.

Current policy debates are focused on expanded temporary or so-called guestworker programs. In some proposals, the numbers to be admitted are very large. At issue are the rights to be accorded to workers who enter through such mechanisms. Also at issue are provisions to protect already resident workers against unfair competition from new arrivals. Current programs, especially for lesser skilled workers, require employers to pay the higher of prevailing or adverse effect wage rates; attest that there is no strike or lockout; provide housing, meals, transportation, worker's compensation or equivalent insurance, and guarantees that the worker will have work on at least three-quarters of the work days within the contract period; and fulfill other similar requirements, depending on the visa category. While these provisions provide protections for workers, employers find them too burdensome and often inappropriate for the type of positions for which they wish to hire foreign workers. As a result, they claim, they are unable to use the existing programs to fill all of the jobs for which they need workers.

Another approach to protecting worker rights would be providing greater mobility within the labor market so foreign workers would not be indebted to a single employer who holds sway over their wages and working conditions. Current policies allow for little mobility until a foreign worker receives a green card. Even when mobility is permitted, foreign workers are often unwilling to change jobs if it will adversely affect their ability to obtain permanent residence, as discussed above.

Is Temporary Ever Temporary?

The existing notions of temporary and permanent admissions do not reflect adequately the nature of today's job market or the realities of immigration. The old adage that "there is nothing more permanent than a temporary worker" is often borne out. When temporary workers are hired to fill year-round, permanent jobs, it is not surprising that many employers do not want them to leave at the end of the term of employment and many foreign workers gain equities and interests in remaining beyond the period of stay. Since some statuses allow for extended stays of more than six years, it is not surprising that many temporary workers build ties to this country through giving birth to children in the United States, buying houses, and establishing roots in American communities. At the other end of the continuum, some immigrants seek permanent residence not because they plan to remain permanently but because a green card affords them opportunities denied to temporary workers (for example, work authorization for their spouses). In an increasingly transnational world in which people maintain ties in more than one country, there is not a clear, bright line between the two categories of permanent and temporary admissions.

This is not to deny the value of a system of permanent residency that leads to citizenship; in fact, the notion that immigrants are presumptive citizens is one of the reasons that immigration has served the national interest for so long. Rather, it is to suggest that there needs to be more flexibility in the definitions used and a recognition that for some, temporary migration may be a transition to permanent status whereas in other cases, temporary migrants (and permanent residents) will return to their home countries or move to a third country.

Some temporary work statuses do take these patterns into account. The H-1B and L visas allow for "dual intent." At the time of admission, a person seeking entry in these categories can admit to being an intending immigrant — someone who hopes to remain in the United States. Most temporary categories, including foreign students, require the foreign national to demonstrate that they have strong enough ties to their home country to overcome the presumption they are an intending immigrant. Even in the categories in which dual intent is allowed, the route to permanent residence may require the exceedingly long waits that were described above, leaving them in limbo until their number comes up in the immigration system.

Complexity in the Immigration System

A final problem in the employment-based immigration system is its very complexity. There are dozens of nonimmigrant visa categories for temporary workers and distinctions in the permanent system are difficult to define (for example, EB-1 is for "foreign nationals of extraordinary ability in the sciences, arts, education, business or athletics," whereas EB-2 is for those with merely exceptional ability). Given the proliferation of visa categories and the often-nuanced differences, applying for any immigration benefit has become an excessively difficult process requiring professional assistance.

Given the proliferation of visa categories and the often-nuanced differences, applying for any immigration benefit has become an excessively difficult process requiring professional assistance.

Conclusion

Reforming the employment-based immigration system should follow a number of principles:

- Policies should be flexible enough to respond to changing market conditions. Statutory ceilings tend to be too inflexible to permit rapid adjustment to economic cycles and needs. Market mechanisms to regulate flows — such as fees that make the cost of hiring foreign workers equal to or greater than US workers or auctions — would constitute one way to manage numbers without ceilings. Another would be to assign a commission or taskforce the responsibility for setting numbers and priorities each year based on their assessment of supply and demand. Such a commission should include members with a wide range of expertise that would also allow them to take into account the economic, demographic, social, civic and other impacts of migration on the United States as well as the short- and long-term effects of immigration levels and waiting times on the immigrants, members of their families, businesses and other US interests.

Requirements placed on workers and employers should be reasonable and consistent with the way in which labor markets function.

- Requirements placed on workers and employers should be reasonable and consistent with the way in which labor markets function. For the most part, temporary programs with no option for extensions or adjustment to permanent residence should be used only to fill jobs that are seasonal or inherently temporary or time-limited in nature. When immigration is used to admit workers to perform jobs that are themselves indefinite in length, temporary status should be seen to have one of two perfectly reasonable outcomes — return or adjustment to permanent residence. Such programs should be seen more precisely as transitional programs, with provisions that permit workers to become legal permanent residents when it is appropriate for both workers and employers to maintain the employment status. There should be sufficient numbers of green cards available to accommodate such adjustment in a timely way so that the workers do not remain in legal limbo for longer than is absolutely necessary to process their applications.

- The government apparatus for managing the system should be efficient and funded sufficiently to carry out its responsibilities for adjudicating applications and monitoring compliance. At present, US Citizenship and Immigration Services is too backlogged with applications to be able to implement new programs in an efficient, effective manner. Without a substantial increase in appropriated funds, USCIS will likely use fees raised by new applicants to work off its backlog, thereby perpetuating its adjudication problems. If Congress establishes new employment-based work programs, it should also appropriate funds to permit backlog clearance.

- Workers should have true mobility within a system that protects them from abusive employment practices. While some provisions in current law meet this standard and are likely to protect workers from sub-standard wages and working conditions, others create burdens on employers with little or no corresponding benefits for either domestic or foreign workers.

- Foreign worker programs can be successful only if employment of unauthorized migrants is curtailed; otherwise, there are few incentives for employers or workers to participate in the government managed programs. At present, the system of employment verification is too prone to fraud and abuse, allowing unauthorized migrants to find work easily and enabling employers to abide by the letter of the law while hiring those without authorization to work. Several options are possible to improve employment verification, ranging from mandatory enrollment in the work authorization verification program (Basic Pilot) already mandated by Congress and implemented by USCIS, to development of a biometric identifier that would be checked by all employers. To ensure the maximum potential for the legal work programs to become a viable alternative to unauthorized migration, currently employed unauthorized workers should be permitted to regularize their status and transition to permanent status. Employers would have few incentives to sign up for the foreign work programs if they risked losing already trained and hard-working employees and the unauthorized would have few incentives to come forward if they could not regularize their status.

Workers should have true mobility within a system that protects them from abusive employment practices.

- Policies should be transparent, understandable to employers and workers, and clear in their definitions and requirements. By contrast, current policies are complex and often indecipherable even to those who have worked many years in the immigration field.

About the Author

Susan Martin

Susan Martin serves as Director of the Institute for the Study of International Migration in the School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University. Previously, Dr. Martin served as the Executive Director of the US Commission on Immigration Reform, established by legislation to advise Congress and the President on US immigration and refugee policy.

Her publications include the *World Migration Report: 2000* (ed.); *Refugee Women*; *The Uprooted: Improving Humanitarian Responses to Forced Migration; Beyond the Gateway: Immigrants in a Changing America* (ed.); *Managing Migration: The Promise of Cooperation* (forthcoming); and numerous monographs and articles on immigration and refugee policy. She is also the principal author of the *2004 World Survey on Women and Development: Women and Migration*, produced for the United Nations. She earned her MA and PhD in American Studies from the University of Pennsylvania and her BA in History from Douglass College, Rutgers University.

MORE FROM MPI:

The Migration Policy Institute (MPI) is an independent, non-partisan, non-profit think tank dedicated to the study of the movement of people worldwide. The institute provides analysis, development, and evaluation of migration and refugee policies at the local, national, and international levels. It aims to meet the rising demand for pragmatic responses to the challenges and opportunities that migration presents in an ever more integrated world. MPI produces the Migration Information Source web site, at www.migrationinformation.org.

This report was commissioned as part of MPI's Independent Task Force on Immigration and America's Future. The task force is a bipartisan panel of prominent leaders from key sectors concerned with immigration, which aims to generate sound information and workable policy ideas.

The task force's work focuses on four major policy challenges:

- The growing unauthorized immigrant population
- Immigration enforcement and security requirements
- Labor markets and the legal immigration system
- Integrating immigrants into American society

The panel's series of reports and policy briefs will lead to a comprehensive set of recommendations in 2006.

Former Senator Spencer Abraham (R-MI) and former Congressman Lee Hamilton (D-IN) serve as co-chairs, and the task force's work is directed by MPI Senior Fellow Doris Meissner, the former Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

The approximately 25 task force members include high-ranking members of Congress who are involved in shaping legislation; leaders from key business, labor and immigrant groups; and public policy and immigration experts. MPI, a nonpartisan think tank dedicated to the analysis of the movement of people worldwide, is partnering with Manhattan Institute and the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars for this project.

For more information on the Independent Task Force on Immigration and America's Future, please visit:

www.migrationpolicy.org

MIGRATION POLICY INSTITUTE

1400 16th Street NW
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20036

202 266 1940
202 266 1900 (fax)

www.migrationpolicy.org
www.migrationinformation.org